ELECTRONICALLY FILED - 2019 March 25 4:18 PM - SCPSC - Docket # 2018-318-E - Page 1 of 28

viarch	25,	2019		
		_01)		

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF
2		KELVIN L. MAJOR
3		ON BEHALF OF
4		THE SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF
5		DOCKET NO. 2018-318-E
6		IN RE: APPLICATION OF DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC
7		FOR ADJUSTMENTS IN ELECTRIC RATE SCHEDULES AND TARIFFS AND
8		REQUEST FOR AN ACCOUNTING ORDER
9		
10	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND OCCUPATION.
11	A.	My name is Kelvin L. Major. My business address is 1401 Main Street, Suite 900,
12		Columbia, South Carolina, 29201. I am employed by the State of South Carolina as an
13		Audit Manager, in the Audit Department of the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff
14		("ORS").
15	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME KELVIN MAJOR WHO PRESENTED DIRECT
16		TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET?
17	A.	Yes. I pre-filed direct testimony and eight (8) exhibits with the Public Service
18		Commission of South Carolina ("Commission") on March 4, 2019.
19	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
20	A.	The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to certain issues raised in the
21		rebuttal testimonies of Duke Energy Progress, LLC. ("DEP" or "Company") witnesses Laura
22		Bateman, Renee Metzler, Lesley Quick, and Retha Hunsicker. My surrebuttal will address
23		the Company's rebuttal testimonies in regards to:

22

23

March 25, 2019 ORS Adjustment #21 to Annualize Operation and Maintenance ("O&M") Non-Labor Cost, 1 2 ORS Adjustment #22 to Normalize O&M Labor Expenses, 3 ORS Adjustment #25 to Amortize Rate Case Costs, 4 ORS Adjustment #28 to Adjust for Credit Card Fees. 5 ORS Adjustment #29 to Adjust O&M for Executive Compensation, 6 ORS Adjustment #30 to Adjust for Customer Connect Additional Expense and Deferral, 7 ORS Adjustment #32 to Synchronize Interest Expense with End of Period Rate Base, ORS Adjustment #33 to Adjust 1/8 O&M for Accounting and Pro Forma Adjustments, 8 9 ORS Adjustment #36 to Remove Certain Expenses, 10 ORS Adjustment #40 Customer Growth Adjustment, and 11 ORS Adjustment #41 to Adjust Revenue, Taxes and Customer Growth for the Proposed 12 Increase. 13 My surrebuttal testimony also updates ORS adjustment amounts for ORS 14 Adjustment #30 to Adjust for Customer Connect Additional Expense and Deferral, Adjustment #32 to Synchronize Interest Expense with End of Period Rate Base, and 15 16 Adjustment #39 to Adjust for Nuclear Supplies and Materials. PLEASE DESCRIBE ORS'S RESPONSE TO THE COMPANY'S REBUTTAL 17 Q. 18 TESTIMONIES IN REGARD TO CERTAIN ADJUSTMENTS. 19 ORS's responses to the adjustments are as follows: Α. 20 Adjustment #21 - Annualize O&M non-labor expenses 21 Company witness Bateman states in her rebuttal testimony that annualizing the

Company witness Bateman states in her rebuttal testimony that annualizing the impacts of inflation to an end of test period level is based on actual known and measurable inflation metrics. Per S.C. Code Ann. Regs.103-823(A)(3), the Commission requires rate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 3 of 15

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

applications to be based on a historic 12-month test period. Traditionally, the Commission allows adjustments to the Test Year to reflect known and measurable changes in the Company's operating experience. Adjustments for "inflation" are not known and measurable. Consistent with Commission Order Nos. 84-108 and 85-841 in which the Commission expressly rejected adjustments for inflation, ORS recommends the Commission reject recovery of these costs, which are based on projections and estimates, as it shifts the risks from the Company to the customers. Customer's rates should not be calculated based on projected costs that may never be incurred by the Company.

Adjustment #22 – Normalize O&M Labor Expenses

Based on the rebuttal testimony of Company witness Bateman, the Company agrees with ORS's adjustment to update the salary allocator for DEP for wages and salaries and related employee benefit costs to the same date as the O&M labor expense, July 1, 2018.

The Company does not agree with ORS's recommendation to remove 50% of the Company's long and short term incentive ("LTI" and "STI") program costs for the reasons discussed by Company witness Metzler. Company witness Metzler's rebuttal testimony primarily addresses the Company's position in regards to overall compensation philosophy, the compensation programs provided by DEP, why a competitive compensation package is important, and how eliminating any portion of incentive compensation would decrease employees' total compensation to less than competitive levels.

Company witness Metzler's rebuttal testimony discusses earnings per share ("EPS") and also mentions Total Shareholder Return ("TSR"). A general definition of TSR is the total return of a stock to an investor, or the capital gain plus dividends. Both EPS and TSR are metrics that involve the performance of a Company's stock. Company witness Metzler's

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

March 25, 2019

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 4 of 15

rebuttal testimony includes Table 1: Summary 2017 STI Plan. This table indicates the Executive Leadership Team's ("ELT") STI payouts are based on 50% EPS and all remaining Non-ELT employees' STI payouts are based on 30% EPS.

Company witness Metzler's rebuttal testimony fails to include the components of the Company's LTI plan where 70% of LTI awards are based 50% on EPS and 25% on TSR, for a total 52.5% of the LTI payouts directly tied to the Company's stock performance. In addition, 30% of the Company's LTI plan payouts are for Restricted Stock Units which are retention payouts of Company stock that are not tied to any performance related metrics. ORS determined that an average adjustment of 50% to total LTI and STI payouts was reasonable and appropriate in this docket. An adjustment of 50% to total LTI and STI plan payouts equitably allocates the costs between customers and shareholders. If employees are largely driven by stock performance rather than the service to customers, a balanced approach to equitably share those costs is important. ORS's recommendation does not require DEP to reduce the total compensation package provided to their employees, only that the costs of the LTI and STI plans be shared equally between customers and shareholders.

An increase in the Company's EPS and TSR, due to an increase in the Company's rates through a rate case, with no actual improved Company efficiency or operating performance, substantially influences the LTI and STI payouts made to employees. This removes the incentive for employees to achieve earnings goals through performance, customer satisfaction, efficiencies, and cost reduction measures. Shareholders are the primary benefactors of increased EPS and TSR, of which these incentives are directly based. It also shifts the risks from the Company to the customer if the Company is allowed recovery of 100% of its LTI and STI payouts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 5 of 15

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

In addition, the Commission has the authority to regulate the Company's management practices and decisions in regard to prudency but does not regulate the Company's management of EPS or TSR. Allowing regulated utilities the recovery of employee incentives based on stock performance, EPS or TSR, would limit the Commission's ability to determine the prudency of those incentives. The Company's request

would also be a vast departure from this Commission's previous decisions on this issue. In

to allow cost recovery of employee incentives based on stock performance, EPS or TSR,

Order No. 2012-951, the Commission found that incentive compensation is an accepted and

necessary component of a utility company's compensation package and that there are sound

reasons for offering incentive compensation as part of a competitively reasonable

compensation package. In that order, the Commission also found that recovery of 50% of

this incentive compensation expense is just and reasonable.

ORS's adjustment to remove 50% of the LTI and STI program incentive costs is reasonable as it is an equitable allocation of the costs between the customers and the Company.

Adjustment #25 - Amortize Rate Case Costs

In rebuttal testimony, Company witness Bateman opposes ORS's recommendations to exclude a return on the deferred rate case expenses during the deferral period and exclude rate case expenses from rate base. ORS reaffirms its original positon to exclude a return on rate case expenses and exclude rate case expenses from rate base as the expenses are related to O&M and are not capital in nature. The Company does not currently have a Commission approved accounting order authorizing a deferral.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 6 of 15

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

In addition, Company witness Bateman opposes ORS's recommendation to disallow certain rate case expenses due to the Company's lack of sufficient documentation to support the costs. ORS attempted on several occasions to obtain sufficient documentation from the Company. On December 12, 2018, ORS sent Audit Request #14 to the Company asking the Company to provide a summary listing of rate case expenses, copies of all invoices and proof of payment. See Confidential Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-9, page 1. On December 20, 2018, the Company responded to Audit Request #14 by providing a summary excel file, legal invoices excel file, an internal labor excel file, and various invoices for some of the legal expenses. Confidential Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-9, page 2 shows an example of the excel information provided for amounts billed to DEP without a supporting invoice. January 3, 2019, ORS issued ORS Audit Request #28 to request copies of legal invoices for the legal expenses that were not supported by the Company, See Confidential Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-9, page 3. On January 9, 2019, the Company responded. See Confidential Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-9, page 4. On January 14, 2019, ORS issued ORS Audit Request #38 to request the Company provide additional detailed information to include billing rates, billed time, and a description of services. This audit request has been attached as Confidential Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-9, page 5. On January 21, 2019, the Company submitted an excel workbook including a column with a general description for the legal expenses, and timesheets which lacked any reference to the specific legal action, service performed, or person billed which are shown on Confidential Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-9, pages 6 and 7.

On February 22, 2019, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC ("DEC") employee Kim H. Smith, along with Company witness Bateman, contacted ORS to discuss the level of detail

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

March 25, 2019

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 7 of 15

that was needed to provide sufficient support. The Company provided a small sample that contained some additional information, which they characterized as the best the Company could provide. ORS clarified that proper documentation for cost recovery would include itemized work performed, hourly rates, and a detailed accounting of the time spent for the work performed. This information should be provided to the Company from the vendor to support the expenses the Company is requesting to include as rate case expenses. ORS cannot verify the summary information created by the Company is accurate. Complete information is important to ensure that customers pay for only expenses related to the rate case. ORS recommends the Commission adopt ORS's adjustment to rate case expenses and reject any rate case expenses not properly supported by the Company.

Adjustment #28 - Adjust for Credit Card Fees

Company witness Quick, in her rebuttal testimony, opposes ORS's recommendation to exclude the Company's growth projections in the calculation of credit card fee expenses. ORS's position for rejecting inflation-based estimates applies to the ORS recommendation the Commission reject the 20% growth projections included by the Company in the calculation of credit card fees. Per S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 103-823(A)(3), the Commission requires rate applications to be based on a historic 12-month test period. Traditionally, the Commission allows adjustments to the Test Year to reflect known and measurable changes in the Company's operating experience. Adjustments for growth projections are not known and measurable. Consistent with Commission Order Nos. 84-108 and 85-841 in which the Commission expressly rejected adjustments for inflation, ORS recommends the Commission reject recovery of these costs, which are based on projections and estimates, as it shifts the

Page 8 of 15

risks from the Company to the customers. Customer's rates should not be calculated based on projected costs that may never be incurred by the Company.

Company witness Quick states that the Company experienced an average historic year over year growth rate of 13% in online payment transactions from 2014 to 2017. In addition, to support her findings, she states that the Company reviewed other utilities around the country implementing fee free credit card usage and found that the projected increase in credit card transactions cited by these utilities ranged from 5% to 30%. This further supports ORS's position as to the uncertainty of the Company's proposed growth projection.

On page eight of Company witness Quick's rebuttal testimony, she proposes the Commission approve a deferral to include the incremental credit card fees that ORS does not recommend be included in this adjustment. ORS recommends the Commission reject Company witness Quick's request to establish a deferral for the credit card fee expenses should the Commission not include the growth projections, as the credit card fees are not extraordinary in circumstance or magnitude, or in the customer's interest. See ORS witness Payne's surrebuttal testimony for discussion of deferrals.

Adjustment #29 - Adjust O&M for Executive Compensation

ORS recommends the Commission adopt the ORS adjustment to O&M for executive compensation. The Company's adjustment eliminates 50% of the compensation (base pay, LTI and STI) of the four DEP executives with the highest level of compensation. ORS does not remove 50% of the LTI and STI payments for these four executives in its adjustment since 50% of those payments were already removed in Adjustment #22 by ORS. ORS reaffirms its calculation of this adjustment.

Adjustment #30 - Adjust for Customer Connect Additional Expenses and Deferral

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 9 of 15

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

Upon review of Company witnesses Bateman's and Hunsicker's rebuttal testimony, ORS proposes an additional adjustment to O&M expenses for the Customer Connect Project to reflect the actual incurred level of expenses in 2018 of \$923,000. This results in an adjustment to O&M of \$763,000 as \$160,000 of costs associated with Customer Connect were included in the test year expenses. Inclusion of this adjustment results in an additional adjustment to income taxes of (\$190,000) for a total adjustment to income taxes of (\$267,000) associated with Customer Connect.

ORS recommends the Commission reject Company witness Hunsicker's forecasted average O&M expense of \$1.4 million. This amount includes forecasted costs of \$550,000 for inflation and contingency. Per S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 103-823(A)(3), the Commission requires rate applications to be based on a historic 12-month test period. Traditionally, the Commission allows adjustments to the Test Year to reflect known and measurable changes in the Company's operating experience. Adjustments for inflation and contingencies are not known and measurable. Consistent with Commission Order Nos. 84-108 and 85-841 in which the Commission expressly rejected adjustments for inflation, ORS recommends the Commission reject recovery of these costs, which are based on projections and estimates, as it shifts the risks from the Company to the customers. Customer's rates should not be calculated based on projected costs that may never be incurred by the Company.

Due to ORS's additional adjustment, ORS recommends cancellation of the accounting order (Order No. 2018-553) for deferred expenses related to Customer Connect on the date of the order issued by the Commission in this docket.

Adjustment #36 – Remove Certain Expenses

Page 10 of 15

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

March 25, 2019

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ORS recommended an adjustment to other O&M expense of (\$875,000) and income taxes of \$218,000 to disallow sponsorships, lobbying expenses, service awards, advertising and other miscellaneous items. These items are non-allowable and not necessary to provide electric service to customers. Subsequent to filing the application, the Company proposed an adjustment to other O&M expense of (\$97,000) and income taxes of \$24,000 to remove lobbying costs and image building advertising.

Based on the rebuttal testimonies of Company witnesses Bateman and Metzler, the Company disagrees with ORS removing items associated with employee incentives, any costs to recognize and reward Company employees, lineman's rodeo costs, organization dues, costs that are not related to South Carolina ("SC"), timing differences and litigation expenses as part of its non-allowable adjustment.

ORS performed its non-allowable review of the Company's accounting records over a three (3) month period, concluded its initial review, and sent its list of non-allowable transactions to the Company on January 28, 2019. ORS requested the Company provide additional supporting documentation and detailed reasoning for why expenses should be allowed and included for recovery from customers. On February 11, 2019, ORS contacted the Company to inquire if the Company's response was forthcoming related to the transactions deemed non-allowable by ORS. On that same day, ORS received a response from the Company which indicated the Company reviewed the ORS spreadsheet containing the list of non-allowables. The Company's response identified certain transactions the Company intended to remove in the updated supplemental filing which included a new pro forma adjustment called "Remove Certain Expenses." The Company's response also identified instances where ORS duplicated removal of the same transaction and instances

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

where ORS recommended removing North Carolina ("NC") specific costs, like Department of Motor Vehicle ("DMV") costs, which were allocated between NC and SC. The Company indicated ORS's adjustment to non-allowables did not identify the comparable SC specific costs that were also allocated between NC and SC.

The Company indicated in its response all remaining transactions identified by ORS in the spreadsheet were reasonable expenses attributed to: prudent utility operations; community engagement; and maintenance of an engaged workforce. ORS requested the Company identify all transactions that were removed more than once, and on February 22, 2019, ORS received the Company's response. ORS modified its non-allowable adjustment to remove duplicate items. The Company provided no additional supporting documentation for specific non-allowable transactions.

Company witness Metzler, in her rebuttal testimony, specifically addresses ORS's non-allowable adjustment in regard to spot bonuses (exceptional contribution awards), lump sum merit payments, service awards, safety awards, lineman's rodeo, and miscellaneous costs to recognize and reward the Company's employees such as: a team lunch, decorations for an office celebration, and coffee supplies in the office. ORS recommended an adjustment to remove amounts associated with spot bonuses, service awards and safety awards, team lunch, coffee supplies in the office, and decorations for an office celebration consistent with Commission Order Nos. 89-573, 91-595, and 94-1229. In these Commission Orders, the Commission removed costs associated with sales incentive awards, safety and length of service awards, other miscellaneous gifts and awards, and parties. ORS removed costs associated with the lineman's rodeo as costs associated with competitions between linemen from various utilities are not necessary to provide quality electric utility service to customers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 12 of 15

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

DEP's customers should not have to pay costs not associated with providing quality electric utility service. ORS's treatment of rodeo related expenses in this docket is consistent with ORS's treatment of rodeo related expenses in other SC gas and electric utility rate cases and Rate Stabilization Act filings. The Company is incorrect in its statement that ORS's nonallowable adjustment removed amounts associated with lump sum merit payments made by the Company.

Company witness Bateman, in her rebuttal testimony, specifically addresses organization dues, costs that are not related to SC, timing differences due to accrual accounting, and litigation expenses. Company witness Bateman specifically identifies the Company's request to recover from its customers membership dues for local Chambers of Commerce, the Historic Marion Revitalization Association, and the Darlington Downtown Revitalization Association. ORS removed 50% of the dues associated with Chambers of Commerce as part of its non-allowable adjustment consistent with Commission Order Nos. 94-1229, 01-887, and 02-285 where the Commission found that one-half of dues paid to state and local Chambers of Commerce should be included in cost of service. In regards to the transactions associated with the Historic Marion Revitalization Association and the Darlington Downtown Revitalization Association, ORS removed amounts associated with these transactions based on the Company's designation of them as being related to "Memberships in Social and Athletic Clubs (including but not limited to Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, Lions, etc.)." Removal of costs for transactions associated with memberships in social and athletic clubs is consistent with Commission Order Nos. 91-595 and 94-1229.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 13 of 15

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

The Company asserts that ORS included in its adjustment for non-allowables transactions related to costs that are not related to SC and timing differences for accrual accounting. ORS provided the Company ample opportunity to identify and provide additional supporting documentation for any transactions for which they did not agree with ORS's treatment as non-allowable. The Company failed to specifically identify transactions included in ORS's non-allowable adjustment related to these items during the non-allowable review process. In fact, despite ORS's request for information from the Company, ORS did not become aware of the Company's treatment of DMV registration fees for transmission vehicles until reading DEC employee Kim H. Smith's rebuttal testimony in Docket No. 2018-319-E. The same is also true for transactions included in ORS's non-allowable adjustment related to expenses incurred and accrued in a previous period but not paid until the test year. Had the Company properly supported these transactions with the explanations in Company witness Bateman's testimony when ORS originally asked for support, ORS would have had the opportunity to closely review and verify these transactions, determine the appropriate treatment, and modify its non-allowable adjustment appropriately. As a result of the Company's actions, ORS has not verified Company's witness Bateman's claims and ORS recommends the Commission reject the Company's position. ORS's removal of litigation expenses as part of its non-allowable adjustment is discussed in detail by ORS witness Hamm's surrebuttal testimony. Adjustments #33 - Adjust for 1/8 O&M for Accounting and Pro Forma Adjustments, Adjustment #40 - Customer Growth, and Adjustment #41 - Adjust Revenue, Taxes and

Customer Growth for the Proposed Increase

Page 14 of 15

1		ORS and the Company agree on the methodology used in calculating these
2		adjustments. ORS and Company amounts differ due to the underlying adjustments of ORS
3		and the Company and the recommended return on equity.
4	Q.	DID ORS UPDATE ANY OTHER ADJUSTMENTS AS PART OF SURREBUTTAL
5		TESTIMONY?
6	A.	Yes. ORS updated ORS Adjustment #32 to Synchronize Interest Expense with End
7		of Period Rate Base due to an increase in the weighted average cost of debt rate to 4.16%
8		from 4.06% as accepted by ORS witness Parcell in his surrebuttal testimony. ORS also
9		updated ORS Adjustment #39 to Adjust Nuclear Materials and Supplies based on the
10		recommendation of ORS witness Morgan in his surrebuttal testimony.
11	Q.	PLEASE IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO YOUR
12		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY.
13	A.	I have attached the following exhibits to my surrebuttal testimony to reflect the
14		update to ORS Adjustment #30 for the Customer Connect Project, the increase in the
15		weighted average cost of debt rate to 4.16% from 4.06%, the update to Adjustment #39 for
16		Nuclear Materials and Supplies, and the resulting changes to fall out adjustments:
17		• Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-1: Operating Experience, Rate Base and Rate of
18		Return Reflecting ORS's Proposed Increase
19		• Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-2: Explanation of Accounting and Pro Forma
20		Adjustments - Retail
21		Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-3: Electric Plant in Service at Original Cost
22		Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-4: Accumulated Depreciation and Amortization —
23		Electric Plant in Service

Duke Energy Progress, LLC

Page 15 of 15 March 25, 2019

- 1 Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-5: Materials and Supplies
- 2 Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-6: Working Capital Investment
- 3 Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-7: Weighted Cost of Capital
- 4 Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-8: Operating Experience, Rate Base and Rate of
- 5 Return Reflecting the Company's Proposed Increase
- 6 Confidential Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-9: Company responses to ORS Audit
- 7 Request #14, #28, and #38
- WILL YOU UPDATE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY BASED ON 8 Q.
- 9 INFORMATION THAT BECOMES AVAILABLE?
- 10 Yes. ORS fully reserves the right to revise its recommendations via supplemental Α.
- 11 surrebuttal testimony should new information not previously provided by the Company, or
- 12 other sources, become available
- 13 DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY? 0.
- 14 Yes, it does. Α.

Duke Energy Progress, LLC
Operating Experience, Rate Base and Rate of Return Reflecting ORS's Proposed Increase
Total and Retail Electric
For the Test Year Ended December 31, 2017
Docket No. 2018-318-E

	TOTA	TOTAL ELECTRIC - NC & SC	0)	(000's Omitted)	LINOS	SOUTH CAROLINA RETAIL		
		(1)		(2)	(3) ORS	(4) After ORS	(5)	(9)
4.		Total Company	3. §	SC Retail	Accounting & Pro Forma	Accounting & Pro Forma	ORS Proposed	After Proposed
No. Description 1 Operating Revenues	∽	Per Books 5,125,685	Per \$	Per Books 562,188 \$	Adjustments (1,453) (A) \$	Adjustments 560,735 \$	Increase 32,130 (R) \$	Increase 592,865
2 Operating Expenses:								
3 Fuel Used in Electric Generation	\$	1,258,015	\$	125,387 \$	15,903 (B) \$	141,290 \$	\$ 0	141,290
		351,214		52,856	(C) 0	52,856	0	52,856
5 Other O&M Expense		1,355,516		145,738		136,711	(S) 0	136,711
6 Depreciation & Amortization		762,731		75,968	45,325 (E)	121,293		121,293
		153,535		20,970	1,896 (F)	22,866	142 (T)	23,008
8 Interest on Customer Deposits		9,367		654	0	654		654
9 Income Taxes		336,771		35,368	(27,743) (G)	7,625	7,981 (U)	15,606
`	S	4,223,769	\$	456,603 \$		482,957 \$	8,123 \$	491,080
12 Operating Income		916:106		105.585	(27.807)	77.778	24.007	101.785
13 Customer Growth		0		0	21 (I)	21	(V) 9	27
14 Net Operating Income for Return	\$	901,916	\$	105,585 \$	(27,786) \$	\$ 661,77	24,013 \$	101,812
_								
16 Gross Plant in Service	S	26,183,538	∽	2,691,449 \$	110,390 (J) \$	2,801,839 \$	\$	2,801,839
1/ Accum. Dept. & Amor 18 Net Plant in Service		(11,299,833)		1.513.529	(3,020) (N) 107.370	1.620.899		1.620.899
		1,126,375		104,777	(2,850) (L)	101,927	0	101,927
,		(418,232)		(11,372)	(46,673) (M)	(58,045)	0	(58,045)
		46,711		4,802	(N) 0	4,802	0	4,802
		(1,909,741)		(212,652)	32,628 (0)	(180,024)	0	(180,024)
_		(103,988)		(10,627)	0 (P)	(10,627)	0	(10,627)
		0		0 0		0	0 0	0
25 Constitution work in Progress 26 Total Rate Base	⇔	13,624,810	\$	1,388,457 \$	90,475	1,478,932 \$	0	1,478,932
27 Rate of Return		6.62%		7.60%		5.26%	II	6.88%
28 Return on Common Equity				10.75%		6.24%	II	9.30%

Duke Energy Progress, LLC
Explanation of Accounting and Pro Forma Adjustments - Retail
For the Test Year Ended December 31, 2017
Docket No. 2018-318-E

						Docket No. 2018-318-E (000's Omitted)	2018-318-E mitted)										
	(1)	(2) Fuel	(3) Purchased	(4)	(2)	(9)	(7)	(8)	6)	(10)	(11) Acciim	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
	Electric	Used in	Power and	Other	Deprec.			Amort.		Electric	Deprec.	Materials		Plant Held	Accum.		
Adj. No. Description	Operating Revenue	Electric Gen.	Net Interchge.	O&M Expense	and Amort.	General Taxes	Income Taxes	of ITC	Cust. Growth	Plant in Service	and Amort.	and Supplies	Working Capital	for Future Use	Deferred Taxes	Oper. Resv.	CWIP
	S	∽	∞	∽	∽	∽	S	∽	∽	S	∽	S	S		∽	\$\$	S
Per ORS Per Company	590			1 1		7 7	147 147										
2 Update fuel costs to approved rate and other fuel related adjustments Per ORS Per Company	397 397	15,903 15,903					(3,869)						(7,041)		1,631		
3 Adjust Other Revenue Per ORS Per Company	89			0		0 0	17										
4 OPEN Per ORS Per Company																	
5 Eliminate unbilled revenuesPer ORSPer Company	(2,508)					8 8	(624) (624)										
6 Adjust for costs recovered through non-fuel riders (Not in Binder) Per ORS Per Company				(16,361)	(6,161)	(603)	5,770			(25,846) (25,846)	8,827		(27,929)		10,062		
7 OPEN Per ORS Per Company																	
8 Annualize depreciation on year end plant balancesPer ORSPer Company					2,777		(693) (699)				(2,777)						
Annualize property taxes on year end plant balancesPer ORSPer Company						376 376	(94)										
10 Adjust for new depreciation ratesPer ORSPer Company					9,386		(2,341)				(6,691)		5,390		(1,345)		

Duke Energy Progress, LLC
Explanation of Accounting and Pro Forma Adjustments - Retail
For the Test Year Ended December 31, 2017
Docket No. 2018-318-E

Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-2 2 of 5

						•	(000's Omitted)	nitted)										
		(1)	(2) Fuel	(3) Purchased	4)	(2)	(9)	(2)	(8)	6)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
		Electric	Used in	Power and	Other	Deprec.		1	Amort.		Electric	Deprec.	Materials		Plant Held	Accum.		
Adj.	Description	Operating Powering	Electric Con	Net	O&M Fynense	and	General Tayos	Income	of	Cust.	Plant in	and	and	Working	for Future Use	Deferred Tayas	Oper.	GWIP
		S S	&		S S	\$	8	8			8	s	S S	S		S		S
11	Adjust for post test year additions to plant in service																	
	Per ORS					5,323	1,063	(1,593)			169,635	(5,323)						
	Per Company					5,327	1,079	(1,598)			176,506	(5,327)						
12	Remove NCEMPA Acquisition Adjustment Per ORS					(1,218)		304			(33,399)	2,944						
	Per Company					(1,218)		304			(33,399)	2,944						
13	Remove expiring amortization credits from test year Per ORS Per Company					30,869		(7,702) (7,702)										
14	OPEN Per ORS Per Company																	
15	Adjust reserve for end of life nuclear costs Per ORS Per Company					0 2,938		0 (733)						0 (2,938)		0 733		
16	Adjust coal inventory Per ORS Per Company												(2,251)					
17	Adjust for previously deferred amounts - Harris COLA, GridSouth, Fukushima/Cybersecurity, 2014 Storms Per ORS Per Company					2,634		(657) (794)						(23,118) (15,754)		5,768		
18	Amortize deferred environmental costs Per ORS Per Company					879 10,080		(2,515)						3,288 40,322		(820) (10,060)		
19	Amortize deferred cost balance related to SC AMI Per ORS Per Company					104		(26)						861 935		(215) (233)		
20	Normalize for storm costs Per ORS Per Company				723			(180) (251)										

Explanation of Accounting and Pro Forma Adjustments - Retail
For the Test Year Ended December 31, 2017
Docket No. 2018-318-E

Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-2 3 of 5

	θ	6	8	9	Ý	(000's Omitted)	nitted)	8	6	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(41)	(31)	919	(1)
	2	Fuel	Purchased	Ē	9	2	E	9	5	(4)	Accum.		(cr)		(21)		
	Electric	Used in	Power and	Other	Deprec.	-		Amort.	7	Electric	Deprec.	Materials		Plant Held	Accum.		
Description	Operating Revenue	Electric Gen.	Net Interchge.	O&M Expense	and Amort.	General Taxes	Income Taxes	of ITC	Cust. Growth	Plant in Service	and Amort.	and Supplies	Working Capital	for Future Use	Deferred Taxes	Oper. Resv. (CWIP
	S	∽	o ∽	S	8	∽	S		\$	S	⇔	⇔	S		\$		\$
Annualize O&M non-labor expenses Per ORS Per Company				0 208			0 (127)										
Normalize O&M labor expenses Per ORS Per Company				(802)		199	150 (808)										
Update benefits costs Per ORS Per Company				2,939			(733) (840)										
Levelize nuclear refueling outage costs Per ORS Per Company				4,256 4,256			(1,062)										
Amortize rate case costs Per ORS Per Company				137			(34)						3,082		0 (769)		
Adjust aviation expenses Per ORS Per Company				(249)		(2)	63										
OPEN Per ORS Per Company																	
Adjust for credit card fees Per ORS Per Company				644			(161)										
Adjust O&M for executive compensation Per ORS Per Company	_			(43)			111										
Adjust for Customer Connect Project Per ORS Per Company				763 1,227	308 515		(267)						0 1,029		0 (257)		
Adjust vegetation management expenses Per ORS Per Company				(160)			40 (77)										

Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-2 4 of 5

Duke Energy Progress, LLC
Explanation of Accounting and Pro Forma Adjustments - Retail
For the Test Year Ended December 31, 2017
Docket No. 2018-318-E

							Docket No. 2018-318-E (000's Omitted)	018-318-E nitted)										
		(I)	(2) Fuel	(3) Purchased	(4)	(5)	(9)	(7)	(8)	(6)	(10)	(11) Accum.	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
;		Electric	Used in	Power and	Other	Deprec.	,		Amort.		Electric	Deprec.	Materials	;	Plant Held	Accum.	(
Adj. No.	J. . Description	Operating Revenue	Electric Gen.	Net Interchge.	O&M Expense	and Amort.	General Taxes	Income Taxes	ot ITC	Cust. Growth	Plant in Service	and Amort.	and Supplies	Working Capital	tor Future Use	Deferred Taxes	Oper. Resv. (CWIP
		∽	9	S	\$	\$	\$	\$	5		∽	∽	S	\$		\$	∽	\$
32																		
	period rate base																	
	Aujustinent Per ORS							(14)										
	Per Company							(51)										
33	Adjust 1/8 O&M for accounting and pro																	
	Adjustment																	
	Per ORS							0						098				
	Per Company							0						1,782				
34																		
	Adjustment							(12 071)								17 000		
	Per UKS Dar Company							(13,8/1)								17,800		
	rei Company							(13,6/1)								17,800		
35	Adjust deferred cost balance related to SC																	
	Adjustment																	
	Per ORS					424		(106)						1,016		(253)		
	Per Company					1,164		(291)						1,164		(291)		
36	Remove Certain Expenses																	
	Adjustment																	
	Per ORS				(875)			218										
	Per Company				0			0										
37																		
	Expense																	
	Adjustment Per ORS						098	(717)										
	Per Company						0	0										
38	Adjust for Ongoing Payment Obligation																	
	Per ORS				0			0										
	Per Company				830			(207)										
39																		
	Adjustment Per ORS												(605)					
	rei Oros Per Company												(966)					
	1 of Company												>					

Duke Energy Progress, LLC
Explanation of Accounting and Pro Forma Adjustments - Retail
For the Test Year Ended December 31, 2017
Docket No. 2018-318-E

Surrebuttal Audit Exhibit KLM-2 5 of 5

3
Fuel Purchased Used in Power and
Gen. Interchge. Expense
∞
15,903 0 (9,027)
15,903 0
(B) (C) (D)
0 0
0 0
(S)

Duke Energy Progress, LLC Electric Plant in Service at Original Cost Test Year Ended December 31, 2017 Docket No. 2018-318-E (000's Omitted)

	_	Total Electric Total Company Per	_		So	uth Carolina Retail Accounting	
Description		Books		Per Books		Adjustments	As Adjusted
Production	\$	15,837,016	\$	1,515,298	\$	64,359 \$	1,579,657
Transmission		2,601,062		242,011		17,453	259,464
Distribution		6,236,202		774,976		23,058	798,034
General		654,815		71,373		6,376	77,749
Intangible Plant	_	498,613	_	51,254	_	(856)	50,398
Subtotal	\$	25,827,708	\$	2,654,912	\$	110,390 \$	2,765,302
Nuclear Fuel	_	355,830		36,537	_	0	36,537
Total Electric Plant in Service	\$_	26,183,538	\$	2,691,449	\$	110,390 \$	2,801,839

Duke Energy Progress, LLC Accumulated Depreciation and Amortization - Electric Plant in Service Test Year Ended December 31, 2017 Docket No. 2018-318-E (000's Omitted)

	_	Total Electric	_		Sou	th Carolina Reta	il	
Description	· <u>-</u>	Total Company Per Books	_	Per Books		Accounting Adjustments		As Adjusted
Production	\$	(6,964,031)	\$	(673,642)	\$	(15,413)	\$	(689,055)
Transmission		(798,253)		(74,529)		(838)		(75,367)
Distribution		(3,005,978)		(373,555)		11,204		(362,351)
General		(249,802)		(27,228)		(1,090)		(28,318)
Intangible Plant	_	(281,789)	_	(28,966)	-	3,117	-	(25,849)
Subtotal	\$	(11,299,853)	\$	(1,177,920)	\$	(3,020)	\$	(1,180,940)
Nuclear Fuel	_	0	_	0	-	0	-	0
Total	\$_	(11,299,853)	\$_	(1,177,920)	\$	(3,020)	\$	(1,180,940)

Duke Energy Progress, LLC Materials and Supplies Test Year Ended December 31, 2017 Docket No. 2018-318-E (000's Omitted)

	<u></u>	Total Electric	_		Sou	th Carolina Reta	il	
Description		otal Company Per Books	_	Per Books		Accounting Adjustments		As Adjusted
Fuel Stock:								
Coal	\$	242,761	\$	24,927	\$	(2,251)	\$	22,676
Oil	_	0_	_	0	_	0	_	0
Total Fuel Stock	\$	242,761	\$	24,927	\$	(2,251)	\$	22,676
Other Electric Materials and Supplies and Stores Clearing		883,614	_	79,850	_	(599)	_	79,251
Total Materials and Supplies	\$	1,126,375	\$	104,777	\$	(2,850)	\$	101,927

Duke Energy Progress, LLC Working Capital Investment Test Year Ended December 31, 2017 Docket No. 2018-318-E (000's Omitted)

		Total Electric	_		Sou	th Carolina Reta	il	
Description	T	otal Company Per Books	_	Per Books		Accounting Adjustments		As Adjusted
12 Mths O&M (Excl PP & Nuclear Fuel)	\$	2,385,539	\$	242,529	\$	6,876	\$	249,405
1/8 of O&M Expenses		298,192		30,316		860		31,176
Less: Average Taxes Accrued	_	(3,472)	_	(353)	_	0	-	(353)
Subtotal: Investor Funds for Operations	\$	294,720	\$_	29,963	\$_	860	\$_	30,823
Required Bank Balance		0		0		0		0
Unamortized Debt Expense		47,999		4,880		0		4,880
Prepayments		72,816		7,403		0		7,403
Customer Deposits		(129,255)		(19,816)		0		(19,816)
Miscellaneous Deferred Debits and Credits		(704,512)	_	(33,802)	_	(47,533)	_	(81,335)
Subtotal: Other Investor Funds	\$	(712,952)	\$_	(41,335)	\$_	(47,533)	\$_	(88,868)
Total Working Capital Investment	\$	(418,232)	\$_	(11,372)	\$_	(46,673)	\$_	(58,045)

Duke Energy Progress, LLC
Weighted Cost of Capital
Retail Electric Operations
For the Test Year Ended December 31, 2017
Docket No. 2018-318-E
(000's Omitted)

	Income For	Return	28,916	72,896	101,812
d Increase	Overall	Cost/Return	1.96% \$	4.92%	8 %88.9
After Proposed Increase	Embedded	Cost/Return (4.16%	9.30%	I
	Rate	Base	860,269	783,834	1,478,932
	Income For	Return	28,916 \$	48,883	\$ 662,77
usted	Overall	Cost/Return	1.96% \$	3.30%	5.26% \$
As Adjus	Embedded	Cost/Return	4.16%	6.24%	II
	Rate	Base	860,269	783,834	1,478,932
	Income For	Return	26,495 \$	79,090	105,585 \$
Books	Overall	Cost/Return	1.91% \$	5.69%	7.60% \$
Retail Per Books	Embedded	Cost/Return	4.06%	10.75%	I
	Rate	Base	652,575	735,882	1,388,457
	Pro Forma	Ratio	47.00% \$	53.00%	100.00% \$
	Calculated Pro Forma	Ratio Ratio	46.85%	53.15%	100.00%
	Capital	Structure	7,257,297	8,233,254	15,490,551 100.00% 100.00%
		Description	Long-Term Debt \$	Members' Equity	Totals \$

Duke Energy Progress, LLC
Operating Experience, Rate Base and Rate of Return Reflecting the Company's Proposed Increase
Total and Retail Electric
For the Test Year Ended December 31, 2017
Docket No. 2018-318-E

(000's Omitted)

	TOTA	TOTAL ELECTRIC - NC & SC		HLOS	SOUTH CAROLINA RETAIL		
		(1)	(2)	(3) OBS	(4) After OBS	(5)	(9)
		Total	SC	Accounting	Accounting	Company	After
٠.		Company	Retail	& Pro Forma	& Pro Forma	Proposed	Proposed
No. Description			Per Bo		Adjustments		Increase
1 Operating Revenues	∽	5,125,685 \$	562,188 \$	(1,453) (A) \$	560,735 \$	68,668 (R) \$	629,403
2 Operating Expenses:							
3 Fuel Used in Electric Generation	8	1,258,015 \$	125,387 \$	15,903 (B) \$	141,290 \$	\$	141,290
		351,214	52,856	(C) 0	52,856	0	52,856
		1,355,516	145,738		136,711	(S) 0	136,711
		762,731	75,968		121,293		121,293
		153,535	20,970	1,896 (F)	22,866	304 (T)	23,170
Interest		9,367	654	0	654		654
		336,771	35,368		7,625	17,057 (U)	24,682
,		_ I		(H)	$\overline{}$		(338)
11 Total Operating Expenses	\$	4,223,769	456,603 \$	26,354 \$	482,957 \$	17,361 \$	500,318
12 Operating Income		910,916	105,585	(27,807)	77,778	51,307	129,085
13 Customer Growth		0	0	21 (I)	21	14 (V)	35
14 Net Operating Income for Return	∽	901,916 \$	105,585 \$	(27,786)	\$ 661,77	51,321 \$	129,120
15 Rate Base:16 Gross Plant in Service	€9	26.183.538	2.691.449 \$	110.390 (J) \$	2.801.839 \$	9	2.801.839
	+		(1,177,920)	\mathbf{S}	_		(1,180,940)
		14,883,685	1,513,529	107,370	1,620,899	0	1,620,899
		1,126,375	104,777	(2,850) (L)	101,927	0	101,927
		(418,232)	(11,372)	_	(58,045)	0 0	(58,045)
21 Plant Held for Future Use 22 Accumulated Deferred Taxes		46,/11 (1 909 741)	4,802	(N) 0 (O) 8 <i>C9 CE</i>	4,802	0 0	4,802
		(103,988)	(10,627)	$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbf{P}) & (\mathbf{P}) \\ 0 & (\mathbf{P}) \end{array}$	(10,627)	0	(10,627)
_		0	0	0	0	0	0
25 Construction Work In Progress	•			<u> </u>			0
26 <u>Total Rate Base</u>	∽	13,624,810 \$	1,388,457 \$	90,475	1,478,932 \$	\$ 0	1,478,932
27 Rate of Return		6.62%	7.60%	Ü	5.26%	II	8.73%
28 Return on Common Equity			10.75%	·	6.24%	I	12.78%

EXHIBIT 9 TO SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF KELVIN L. MAJOR

CONFIDENTIAL

FILED UNDER SEAL WITH COMMISSION 2018-318-E

Application of Duke Energy Progress, LLC for Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs and Request for an Accounting Order